

Serial No. 10/059,623

May 3, 2004

Reply to the Office Action dated March 1, 2004

Page 10 of 27

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached fourteen sheets of Drawings include changes to Figs. 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9-15, 16C, 16D, 17-20, 23, and 25-27.

Attachment: Fourteen Replacement Sheets.

Serial No. 10/059,623

May 3, 2004

Reply to the Office Action dated March 1, 2004

Page 11 of 27

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 12-33 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants AMEND the Drawings, the Specification, and claims 12 and 23.

As stated in the previous Amendment, dated December 6, 2003, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner rejoin, consider, and allow withdrawn claims 13-22 and 24-33 when generic claims 12 and 23 are allowed.

The Figs. 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9-15, 16D, 17-20, 23, and 25-27 of the Drawings were objected to for allegedly failing to properly cross-hatch dielectric material. Applicants have amended Figs. 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9-15, 16D, 17-20, 23, and 25-27 as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the Drawings.

The Examiner objected to the Specification for allegedly containing minor informalities. The Examiner alleged that reference number **90** of **Fig. 13** needs description. The description of this reference number was added on page 7 of the previous Amendment, filed December 6, 2003. Applicants have amended the Specification to correct the other minor informalities noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the Specification.

Claims 12 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Richards et al. (U.S. 5,834,995). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 12 and 23.

Claim 12 has been amended to recite:

“A microstrip line, comprising:  
a dielectric substrate having a front surface and a back surface;  
a ground electrode provided on the back surface of said dielectric substrate; and  
a line electrode provided on the front surface of the dielectric substrate; wherein  
edge electrodes are provided at edges on both sides of the line electrode;

Serial No. 10/059,623

May 3, 2004

Reply to the Office Action dated March 1, 2004

Page 12 of 27

said edge electrodes are arranged substantially perpendicular to the front surface of the dielectric substrate; and  
**the line electrode and the edge electrodes are defined by only a single layer electrode.**" (emphasis added)

Applicants' claim 12 recites the feature of "the line electrode and the edge electrodes are defined by only a single layer electrode." Applicants' claim 23 recites features which are similar to features recited in Applicants' claim 12, including the above emphasized features. With the improved features of claims 12 and 23, Applicants have been able to provide a microstrip line that reduces the edge effect of the line electrode (see, for example, the paragraph bridging pages 3 and 4 of the originally filed Specification).

Applicants have amended claims 12 and 23 to recite the feature of "the line electrode and the edge electrodes are defined by only a single layer electrode." Richards et al. clearly teaches in **Figs. 12 and 14a** that the line electrode and the edge electrodes are defined by at least two layers of electrodes, **NOT** defined by only a single layer electrode as recited in Applicants' claims 12 and 23. Richards et al. clearly discloses in the second full paragraph in column 7 that "the cylindrical edge elements are formed by electroplating the exposed lateral edges of the microstrip conductor [line electrode] ..." In other words, Richards et al. discloses that the line electrode and the edge electrode include at least two layers of electrodes, not only a single layer electrode. Thus, Richards et al. certainly fails to teach or suggest the feature of "the line electrode and the edge electrodes are defined by only a single layer electrode" as recited in Applicants' claims 12 and 23.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Richards et al.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the prior art of record, applied alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the unique combination and

Serial No. 10/059,623

May 3, 2004

Reply to the Office Action dated March 1, 2004

Page 13 of 27

arrangement of elements recited in claims 12 and 23 of the present application. As noted above, since claims 12 and 23 are generic, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner rejoin, consider and allow claims 13-22 and 24-33 upon allowance of generic claims 12 and 23.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 3, 2004

  
Attorneys for Applicants

Joseph R. Keating  
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett  
Registration No. 46,710

**KEATING & BENNETT LLP**  
10400 Eaton Place, Suite 312  
Fairfax, VA 22030  
Telephone: (703) 385-5200  
Facsimile: (703) 385-5080